arXiv:1109.3626v3 [physics.gen-ph] 23 Aug 2012

For *Phys.Rev.Lett.*

Proposed explanation of galactic halos

R. K. Nesbet
IBM Almaden Research Center, 650 Harry Road, San Jose, CA 95120-6099, USA

(Dated: August 24, 2012)

As a galaxy forms by condensation from the cosmic background it necessarily depletes the surrounding primordial matter density. Any resulting gravitational effect would be observed as refraction of radiation and radial acceleration of orbiting mass. The depleted background would imply a gravitational halo essentially spherical for galaxies of all shapes. Standard Einstein theory would imply centrifugal acceleration, contrary to observation. Centripetal acceleration is explained by conformal theory, without assuming dark matter. Halo radius is determined by galactic baryonic mass. The model is consistent with observed anomalous galactic rotation and Hubble expansion.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv,98.80.-k,98.62.Gq

I. INTRODUCTION

In the accepted empirical model[1–3], an isolated galaxy is surrounded by a much larger spherical dark matter halo. What is actually observed is a halo of gravitational field that deflects photons in gravitational lensing and increases the velocity of orbiting mass particles. It will be shown here that conformal theory[4, 5] supports an alternative interpretation of lensing and anomalous rotation as gravitational effects due to depletion of the background by concentration of diffuse mass into an observed galaxy.

The concept of dark matter galactic halos originates from dynamical studies[6, 7] which indicate that a spiral galaxy such as our own would lack long-term stability if not supported by an additional gravitational field from some unseen source. This concept is supported by other cosmological data[2], including gravitational lensing[8, 9]. A central conclusion of standard ΛCDM cosmology[1, 2] is that inferred dark matter outweighs baryonic matter.

If dark matter interacted only through gravity, Poisson's equation would determine a phenomenologically equivalent distribution of dark matter for any unexplained gravitational field. Omitting the effect of subtracted cosmic background, whose reversed sign could not be accounted for, the excess centripetal acceleration observed in orbital velocities and lensing is attributed in standard ΛCDM theory[1, 2] to a dark matter halo.

As a galaxy forms, background matter density ρ_m condenses into observed galactic density ρ_g. Conservation of mass and energy requires total galactic mass M to be missing from a depleted background. Since the primordial density is uniform and isotropic, the depleted background can be modeled by a sphere of radius r_H, such that $4\pi\rho_m r_H^3/3 = M$. In particular, the integral of $\rho_g - \rho_m$ must vanish.

What, if any, would be the gravitational effect of a depleted background density? An analogy, in well-known physics, is impurity scattering of electrons in conductors. In a complex material with a regular periodic lattice independent electron waves are by no means trivial functions, but they propagate without contributing to scattering or resistivity unless there is some lattice irregularity, such as a vacancy. Impurity scattering depends on the difference between impurity and host atomic T-matrices[10]. Similarly, a photon or isolated mass particle follows a geodesic in the cosmic background unless there is some disturbance of the uniform density ρ_m. Both the condensed galactic density ρ_g and the extended subtracted density $-\rho_m$ contribute to the deflection of background geodesics. Such effects would be observed as gravitational lensing of photons and as radial acceleration of orbiting mass particles, following the basic concepts of general relativity.

II. GRAVITATIONAL EFFECTS OF THE DEPLETED HALO

A gravitational halo is treated here as a natural consequence of galaxy formation. Condensation of matter from the primordial uniform mass-energy distribution leaves a depleted sphere that has an explicit gravitational effect. The implied subtracted mass, which integrates to minus the total galactic mass, cannot be ignored. If this mass were simply removed, the analogy to vacancy scattering in solids implies a lensing effect, because a background geodesic is no longer a geodesic in the empty sphere. Standard gravitational theory would predict centrifugal acceleration due to a depleted background halo. In contrast, it will be shown that conformal theory[4, 5] explains the observed centripetal character of halo gravitation, without invoking dark matter. This halo model accounts for the otherwise remarkable fact that galaxies of all shapes are embedded in essentially spherical halos.

Recent analysis of galactic rotation velocities, not assuming dark matter[4, 11–13], fits observed data consistent with empirical regularities. This tests the empirical validity of modified theory. A conformal model of the Higgs scalar field[5, 14] agrees with consensus Hubble expansion parameters[15, 16] back to the CMB epoch, also without dark matter. Observed acceleration of Hubble expansion[17, 18] implies centrifugal acceleration in the cosmic background, verified by conformal theory[5]. This is consistent with centripetal acceleration due to the subtracted mass density of a background halo.

Strict conformal symmetry[4] requires invariance of field action integrals under local Weyl scaling[19], such that $g_{\mu\nu}(x) \to g_{\mu\nu}(x)\Omega^2(x)$, where $\Omega(x)$ is real. For a scalar field, $\Phi(x) \to \Phi(x)\Omega^{-1}(x)$. A conformal energy-momentum tensor must be traceless. This is true for massless fermion and gauge boson fields, but not for the Einstein tensor. Conformal gravity[4] removes this inconsistency. Subgalactic phenomenology is preserved, but gravitation on a galactic scale is modified.

Variational theory for fields in general relativity is a straightforward generalization of classical field theory[20]. Given Riemannian scalar Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$, action integral $I = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}$ is required to be stationary for all differentiable field variations, subject to appropriate boundary conditions. g here is the determinant of metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$. Gravitational field equations are determined by metric functional derivative $X^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\delta I}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}}$. Any scalar $\mathcal{L}_a$ determines energy-momentum tensor $\Theta_a^{\mu\nu} = -2X_a^{\mu\nu}$, evaluated for a solution of the field equations.

Conformal $\mathcal{L}_g$ is uniquely defined by quadratic contraction of the conformal Weyl tensor[19]. Uniquely defined $\mathcal{L}_\Phi$ for a conformal scalar field Φ contains the gravitational Ricci scalar. Because the Weyl tensor vanishes identically in uniform isotropic geometry, a conformal scalar field is required to drive Hubble expansion[4]. This implies a gravitational field equation in which Newton's constant is replaced by a coefficient of opposite sign and different magnitude[4]. The conformal Higgs model[5, 14] identifies this field with the Higgs scalar field required to determine gauge boson masses in electroweak theory[21]. Although Newton's constant and Planck units are not relevant, the theory describes Hubble expansion consistent with consensus cosmological data[5].

The gravitational field of conformal gravity[22] can account for anomalous galactic rotation[23] without invoking dark matter. The fit to observed data implies a significant effect of the cosmic background, external to a luminous galactic core. The inferred mass-independent rotational parameter is equivalent to cosmic background curvature[4, 22]. Attributed here to a galactic halo, this is a direct measurement of a centripetal effect. A derivation summarized below shows that the implied curvature parameter is consistent with consensus cosmological data[15, 16]. The present model of a gravitational halo is consistent with conformal theory of both galactic rotation and Hubble expansion[5].

III. ANOMALOUS GALACTIC ROTATION AND HUBBLE EXPANSION

In conformal theory the most general spherically symmetric static exterior Schwarzschild metric outside a source density takes the form[22]

$$ds^2_{ES} = B(r)dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{B(r)} - r^2 d\omega^2, \tag{1}$$

for $B(r) = 1 - 2\beta/r + \gamma r - \kappa r^2$. Here $c = \hbar = 1$ and $d\omega^2 = d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2$. If dark matter is absent, Keplerian parameter $\beta = GM$ is proportional to total baryonic mass M[13, 22]. Neglecting parameter κ, Mannheim[23] determined two universal parameters such that $\gamma = \gamma^* N^* + \gamma_0$ fits rotational data for eleven typical galaxies, not invoking dark matter. N^* here is total visible plus gaseous mass in units of solar mass. This has recently been extended to 110 spiral galaxies whose orbital velocities are known outside the optical disk[11, 12]. Parameter κ is fitted as a global constant, not determined by a specific boundary condition. Parameter γ_0, independent of galactic mass, implies a necessarily isotropic cosmological source. Hence the parametrized gravitational field forms a spherical halo[5]. A consistency test is that the same field should account for gravitational lensing, if adequate data are available.

For $r \ll r_H$ outside the galactic core, conformal velocity function $v^2(r) = GM/r + \gamma r/2$ has a broad local minimum at $r_x^2 = 2GM/\gamma$. Evaluated at r_x, $\gamma r_x/2 = GM/r_x$, such that $v^4(r_x) = 4(\gamma r_x/2)(GM/r_x) = 2\gamma GM$. If $\gamma^* N^* \ll \gamma_0$ and dark matter is omitted, this is an exact baryonic Tully-Fisher relation, as inferred from recent analysis of galactic data[13]. Centripetal acceleration at r_x determines MOND parameter[2] $a_0 = 2\gamma$.

A uniform, isotropic cosmos with Hubble expansion is described by the Robertson-Walker (RW) metric

$$ds^2_{RW} = dt^2 - a^2(t)(\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\omega^2). \tag{2}$$

The conformal Higgs model determines a modified Friedmann cosmic evolution equation[5], for scale parameter $a(t)$, that fits cosmological data back to the CMB epoch[15, 16] without invoking dark matter. In RW geometry the gravitational constant is replaced by a parameter of different sign and magnitude. The Einstein tensor is replaced by a traceless conformal tensor. The standard Friedmann sum rule, $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_k = 1$, becomes $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_k + \Omega_q = 1$ for the modified equation. Radiation energy density is included in Ω_m here. The dimensionless weights are $\Omega_m(t)$ for mass density, $\Omega_k(t)$ for curvature, and $\Omega_\Lambda(t)$ for dark energy, augmented in the modified sum rule[5] by acceleration weight $\Omega_q(t) = \frac{\ddot{a}a}{\dot{a}^2}$. The Higgs mechanism induces a nonvanishing scalar field. Its conformal energy-momentum tensor defines a cosmological constant [4, 5] whose empirical magnitude is confirmed by an approximate coupled-field computation[14].

Luminosity distances $d_L(z)$ for type Ia supernovae with redshifts $z \leq 1$ can be fitted accurately by ΛCDM with curvature and mass parameters $\Omega_k = 0$, $\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda$[1, 2]. Mannheim[4] finds an equally valid fit with $\Omega_m = 0$, using the standard Friedmann equation. A problem is that the standard dimensionless sum rule implies large $\Omega_k = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda$, in conflict with consensus flat geometry $\Omega_k \simeq 0$.

This conflict is resolved by the modified Friedmann equation, for which the sum rule contains acceleration weight Ω_q[5]. Setting both Ω_m and Ω_k to zero, the sum rule is $\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_q = 1$ and a numerical solution of the modified Friedmann equation[5], fitted to supernovae data for $z \le 1$, determines $\Omega_\Lambda(t_0) = 0.732, \Omega_q(t_0) = 0.268$. This is consistent with empirical $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.725 \pm 0.016, \Omega_k = -0.0025 \pm 0.0108$[16]. The only significant free parameter in the current epoch is dark energy. For $\Omega_m \neq 0$, the integrated function $a(t)$[5] describes an initial epoch of rapid increase, possibly identified with big-bang phenomenology[1]. Acceleration weight Ω_q is always positive, decreasing asymptotically to zero as $t \to \infty$. Implied empirical parameters retain the Higgs gauge boson mass formula but do not define a standard massive Higgs particle[24].

IV. PARAMETERS γ AND κ

The depleted halo model removes a particular conceptual problem in fitting parameters γ and κ of ds^2_{ES} to galactic rotation data[4, 11, 23]. In empirical parameter $\gamma = \gamma^* N^* + \gamma_0$, γ_0 does not depend on galactic mass, so must be due to the surrounding cosmos[23]. Mannheim considers this to represent the net effect of distant matter, integrated out to infinity[4]. Since the interior term, coefficient $\gamma^* N^*$, is centripetal, one might expect the term in γ_0 to be centrifugal, describing attraction to an exterior source. However, if coefficient γ_0 is due to a depleted halo, the implied sign change determines net centripetal acceleration, in agreement with observation.

Integration parameter κ, included in fitting rotation data[11, 12], cuts off gravitational acceleration at a boundary radius. In the halo model, κ is determined by the boundary condition of continuous acceleration field at halo radius r_H, determined by galactic mass, except for the nonclassical linear potential term due to to the baryonic galactic core.

Universal parameter γ_0 implies a halo contribution to function $v^2(r)$ that is the same for all galaxies, deviating only as r approaches the halo radius. For galaxies of the same mass, the full parameter $\gamma = \gamma^* N^* + \gamma_0$ implies identical "dark matter" rotation curves, as exemplified for galaxies NGC2403 and UGC128 in Fig.1 of Reference[25]. This supports the empirical argument for a universal nonclassical rotation curve[3] and for a fundamental relationship between observed baryonic mass and inferred dark mass[25]. Such a relationship is an immediate consequence of the depleted halo model.

As shown below, for $r \le r_H$ but outside baryonic density bound r_g, v^2 for galactic rotation is the sum of three independent terms:

$$v^2_{core} = \frac{GM}{r}(1 - r^3/r^3_H), \tag{3}$$

$$v^2_{halo} = \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 r(1 - r/r_H), \tag{4}$$

$$v^2_{ext} = \frac{1}{2}N^*\gamma^* r(1 - r/r_*). \tag{5}$$

This defines cutoff parameter $\kappa_{core} = GM/r^3_H$ and nonclassical $\kappa_{halo} = \gamma_0/2r_H$, which enforce continuity by terminating the acceleration field at r_H. Both Keplerian and halo terms vanish outside the halo. Interactions between galaxies beyond their halo radii can depend only on the extended field that determines v^2_{ext}, the nonclassical external field of the galactic core. Hence the Newtonian virial theorem is not valid, and $\kappa^* = \gamma^*/2r_*$ may depend on galactic cluster environment. It would be informative to fit galactic rotation data[12] using parameters κ_{halo} (dependent on baryonic mass) and κ^*, which might depend on cluster structure.

The conformal gravitational field equation is

$$X^{\mu\nu}_g + X^{\mu\nu}_\Phi = \frac{1}{2}\Theta^{\mu\nu}_m, \tag{6}$$

which has an exact solution in the depleted halo, where $\Theta^{\mu\nu}_m = 0$. Outside r_g, the source-free solution of $X^{\mu\nu}_g = 0$ in the ES metric[22] determines parameters proportional to galactic mass. $X^{\mu\nu}_\Phi = 0$ is solved in the RW metric as a modified Friedmann equation without ρ_m. This determines $\Omega_q(halo)$, which differs from $\Omega_q(cosmos)$ determined by $X^{\mu\nu}_\Phi = \frac{1}{2}\Theta^{\mu\nu}_m(\rho_m)$. These two equations establish a relation between $\Delta\Omega_q = \Omega_q(halo) - \Omega_q(cosmos)$ and $\Delta\rho = \rho_g - \rho_m$, which reduces to $-\rho_m$ in the halo outside r_g.

Geodesic deflection in the halo is due to net gravitational acceleration $\Delta\Omega_q$, caused by $\Delta\rho$. Because the metric tensor is common to all three equations, the otherwise free parameter γ_0 in equation $X^{\mu\nu}_g = 0$ must be compatible with the X_Φ equations. This can be approximated in the halo (where $X^{\mu\nu}_g = 0$) by solving equation $\Delta X^{\mu\nu}_\Phi = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Theta^{\mu\nu}_m$, where $\Delta X_\Phi = X_\Phi(halo) - X_\Phi(cosmos)$ and $\Delta\Theta_m = \Theta_m(halo) - \Theta_m(cosmos) = -\Theta_m(\rho_m)$. Integration constant γ_0 is determined by conformal transformation to the ES metric. Note that if the subtracted $X_\Phi(cosmos)$ were omitted, this would imply $\gamma_0 = 0$.

From the modified Friedmann equation, acceleration weight $\Omega_q(cosmos) = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda - \Omega_k - \Omega_m$. Assuming a gravitationally flat true vacuum, $\Omega_m = 0$ implies $\Omega_k = 0$ in the halo. Equation $X^{\mu\nu}_\Phi(halo) = 0$ implies $\Omega_q(halo) = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda$, so that $\Delta\Omega_q = \Omega_k + \Omega_m$. If $|\Delta\Omega_q| \ll \Omega_q$, dark energy weight Ω_Λ cancels out, as does any vacuum value of k independent of ρ_m. Because both Ω_k and Ω_m contain negative coefficients, if ρ_m implies positive k in the cosmic background, $\Delta\Omega_q$ is negative, producing centripetal acceleration. Thus positive γ_0, deduced from galactic rotation. is determined by the cosmic background, as anticipated by Mannheim[4].

To summarize the logic of the present derivation, Eq.(6) has an exact solution for $r_g \leq r \leq r_H$, outside the observable galaxy but inside its halo, assumed to be a true vacuum with $\Theta_m^{\mu\nu} = 0$ because all matter has been absorbed into the galactic core. For an isolated galaxy, Ω_q is nonzero, dominated at present time t_0 by dark energy Ω_Λ. Observed effects due to deflection of background geodesics measure difference function $\Delta\Omega_q = \Omega_k + \Omega_m$, inferred from the inhomogeneous cosmic Friedmann equation in the RW metric.

For uniform isotropic mass-energy density, as in a depleted halo, ES and RW metrics are related by a conformal transformation such that $|k| = \frac{1}{4}\gamma_0^2$[22], subject to analytic condition $k\gamma_0 < 0$.

ES metric radial acceleration parameter $\gamma_0 = 3.06 \times 10^{-30}/cm$, deduced from anomalous galactic rotation[4, 11, 23] in the halo region, determines RW metric curvature for the implied halo[24] $k_H = -\gamma_0^2/4 = -2.34 \times 10^{-60}/cm^2$. The cosmic background, subtracted in the halo, must have RW curvature $k = -k_H$. In Hubble units $(H_0/c)^2$, this implies dimensionless $\Omega_k(t_0) = -0.403 \times 10^{-3}$ at present time t_0. This is consistent with empirical value $\Omega_k = -0.0025 \pm 0.0108$[16]. Consistency of lensing and anomalous rotation constrains both ΛCDM and conformal models. Accurate rotational and lensing data for the same galaxy would provide a quantitative test of theory. Such a test is needed to characterize density ρ_m, not necessarily excluding dark matter.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Growth of a galaxy by condensation from the primordial cosmos implies a gravitational halo field due to depletion of the original uniform isotropic mass distribution. Standard Einstein-Hilbert theory, implying centrifugal acceleration of a photon or orbiting mass particle in this halo, is contradicted by observed centripetal lensing and enhanced rotation velocities. In uniform isotropic (Robertson-Walker) geometry, conformal gravitational theory replaces the Newton constant by an effective constant of opposite sign and different magnitude, determined by a cosmological scalar field. This is consistent with the observed centripetal acceleration.

If the cosmological scalar field is identified with the Higgs scalar field of electroweak theory, then observed Hubble expansion data going back to the CMB epoch and observed excessive galactic rotational velocities are found to be consistent with conformal theory and with the proposed depleted halo model, in no case requiring unobserved dark matter.

The depleted conformal halo model implies that a galaxy of mass M produces a halo of exactly equal and opposite mass deficit. This resolves the paradox for ΛCDM that despite any interaction other than gravity, the amount of dark matter inferred for a galactic halo is strongly correlated with the galactic luminosity or baryonic mass[3, 25].

Conservation of matter implies a depleted gravitational halo accompanying any local condensation of the cosmic background. This has the effect of stabilizing such condensations, so that instead of requiring an initial concentration of dark matter, with subsequent formation of a stabilized baryon concentration, the two effects would be simultaneous. This does not necessarily conflict with current dynamical models of galaxy and galactic cluster formation. It would be interesting to incorporate the present model into such a dynamical model as a possible test of theory.

---

[1] S. Dodelson, *Modern Cosmology* (Academic Press, NY, 2003).

[2] R. H. Sanders, *The Dark Matter Problem* (Cambridge Univ. Press, NY, 2010).

[3] P. Salucci et al, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **378**, 41 (2007).

[4] P. D. Mannheim, *Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys.* **56**, 340 (2006). (arXiv:astro-ph/0505266v2)

[5] R. K. Nesbet, *Mod.Phys.Lett.A* **26**, 893 (2011).

[6] J. P. Ostriker and P. J. E. Peebles, *ApJ* **186** , 467 (1973).

[7] J. P. Ostriker, P. J. E. Peebles and A. Yahil, *ApJ* **193**,L1 (1974).

[8] D. Walsh, R. F. Carswell, and R. J, Weymann, *Nature* **279**, 381 (1979).

[9] H. Hoekstra et al, *ApJ* **504**, 636 (1998).

[10] R. K. Nesbet, *IBM J.Res.Develop.* **42**, 53 (1998).

[11] P. D. Mannheim and J. G. O'Brien, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **106**, 121101 (2011).

[12] P. D. Mannheim and J. G. O'Brien, (arXiv:1011.3495v2 [astr-ph.CO])

[13] S. S. McGaugh, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **106**, 121303 (2011).

[14] R. K. Nesbet, (arXiv:1004.5097v2 [physics.gen-ph])

[15] E. Komatsu et al, *ApJS* **180**, 330 (2009).

[16] E. Komatsu et al, *ApJS* **192**, 18 (2011).

[17] A. G. Riess et al, *ApJ* **116**, 1009 (1998).

[18] S. Perlmutter et al, *ApJ* **517**, 565 (1999).

[19] H. Weyl, *Sitzungber.Preuss.Akad.Wiss.* 465 (1918).

[20] R. K. Nesbet, *Variational Principles and Methods in Theoretical Physics and Chemistry.* (Cambridge Univ. Press, NY, 2003).

[21] W. N. Cottingham and D. A. Greenwood, *An Introduction to the Standard Model of Particle Physics.* (Cambridge Univ. Press, NY, 1998).

[22] P. D. Mannheim and D. Kazanas, *ApJ* **342**, 635 (1989).

[23] P. D. Mannheim, *ApJ* **479**, 659 (1997).

[24] R. K. Nesbet, (arXiv:1009.1372v2 [physics.gen-ph])

[25] S. S. McGaugh, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **95**, 171302 (2005).